Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XII., No. 3. JUNE, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Anglican Communion.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Spirit of Modernism 113
The Editor.

What is Christianity? 122
W. R. Inge, D.D., C.V.O.

The Bible 129
E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., F.R.S.

The Incarnation 136
J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D.

The Holy Spirit 146
Charles E. Raven, B.D.

The Church Catholic 154
Hubert Handley, M.A.

The Kingdom of God 162
Cyril Norwood, D.Lit.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: AMERICA—C. H. DANIELS, 49 West 55th Street, New York, U.S.A.
SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALIA—A. McCUBBIN & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 102 Wakefield Street, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Miss E. M. ALLEN, M.A.
Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Right Rev. A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Principal F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt.
Miss D. NUSSEY.
Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Principal Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 14 Priory Road, Kilburn, N.W.6.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10.

Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1922. Vol. XII.

THE SPIRIT OF MODERNISM

By the Editor.

THE six sermons which constitute this issue of the *Modern Churchman* were delivered under the general title, *Christianity; Ancient and Modern*, to large congregations of junior members of the University of Oxford in the church of St. Peter-in-the-East during Trinity Term. They may be taken to be representative Modernist expositions of the important themes which they treat. By representative we do not mean that the reader will find the preachers in agreement on every point. But the spirit is more than the letter, and these addresses reflect the spirit of present-day English Modernism, and are, we hope, able to transmit it.

In view of the confusion which exists in the minds of many as to what English Modernism really is, it is well to state emphatically at the outset that it must not be identified with Roman Modernism. There is the widest distinction between them. The Roman Modernists endeavoured to profess fervent loyalty to the whole dogmatic, liturgical and ecclesiastical system of the Roman Church, while accepting and proclaiming the most extreme conclusions of a highly rationalist, if not actually sceptical, criticism. With this object they were compelled to distinguish between what they called 'matter of science' and 'matter of faith,' and in consequence to separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of Catholic worship. In effect they acknowledged two Christs: one a dim and lowly historical figure, with whom the believer has little to do; the other the

apotheosis of the Catholic Church. St. Paul hoped that the Church might grow up *into* Christ; the view of the Continental Modernist was that the Church had replaced the Jesus of history.

English Modernism is utterly opposed to this, as it seems to us, false and futile distinction. Nowhere has this been better expressed than by the Dean of St. Paul's:

> 'We do not believe in two Christs—one of them a Galilean prophet of "limited intelligence," and the other a half-religious, half-political organisation with a very chequered record. We believe in one Christ, the Word or *Expression* of God, who was in the beginning with God, through whom, as the life-principle of all that comes into being, all things were made, and in whom all things consist; whose reign is coextensive with the history of the world; whose nature, character, and purposes, so far as humanity is concerned, were once for all fully expressed and revealed in the person of Jesus; and whose Spirit has ever since dwelt with the Church which He founded, striving, through that Church, to exhibit another Theophany in the life of humanity itself. But for us the historic Christ is not the Church, but the Christ of the Gospels. There are details about the manner of that historic revelation upon which the last word has not yet been said; but the revelation itself remains, the record of a life in which the ideal of humanity has been once for all realised. If this were not so, it would be disingenuous trifling to call the inner light, or witness of God within us, the spirit of *Christ*; there would be no reason to connect the witness of God with His name. But when we read the Gospels, we feel that there *is* good reason to connect them. The measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ *is* the final consummation of human development. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that this is so. To grow up into Him in all things sums up our task, whether as individuals or as branches of the Church. There is no development or change in Him, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; it is we, individually and collectively, who are to grow up into, and never out of, Him.'[1]

It is this wide difference between Roman Modernism and English Modernism which has led some English theologians to deplore the application of the term Modernist to our English movement. Nevertheless, it is a better title than either Broad Churchman or Liberal Churchman. The former term suggests an Erastian Latitudinarianism, which is not a mark of the present movement, and Liberal Churchman is apt to signify in the popular mind the adherent of a political party. Modernist, if it be dissociated from its Roman connection, does express the distinction which exists between ourselves and our Traditionalist or Mediaevalist fellow-Churchmen. However, it is too

[1] *Faith and Knowledge* (T. and T. Clark), pp. 290-2.

late to debate about the suitability of our appellation. In this world, where things are not always so nicely arranged as in Miss Maria Edgeworth's *Moral Tales*, our names are given to us by others and with little regard for our feelings, and have a capacity for sticking to us even if we would part from them. Such a situation calls not for tears, but for the spirit which coined the classical proverb: *Σπάρταν ἔλαχες, ταύταν κόσμει*, Sparta is your lot, make the most of it.

What, then, is Modernism? Father George Tyrrell once described it in terms which we need not hesitate to adopt as applicable to English Modernism.

> 'I think that the best description of Modernism is that it is the desire and effort to find a new theological synthesis, consistent with the data of historico-critical research. . . . By a Modernist I mean a churchman of any sort who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity.'

Sabatier's subtle distinction ought to be noted, for it describes the present position of English Modernism:

> 'Modernism is not a system or a new synthesis: it is an orientation.'

Dr. Macbride Sterrett, in his recent work, *Modernism in Religion*,[2] developes Sabatier's distinction thus:

> 'Modernism stands for a new spirit and for modern methods in the study and teaching of religion and ethics. . . . It accepts the results of modern methods and asks that they be incorporated with older views. It does not offer a new set of dogmas, but it does ask for a modern interpretation of the older ones. It insists that religion is more vital than theology and must be distinguished from it. It alters our scientific, historical and theological outlook, but leaves our personal relation to Christ untouched. It is a vitalizing spirit making all things new, and an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed. . . . It seeks to meet difficulties already raised by our modern world-view, rather than to raise up new ones.'

Mrs. Humphry Ward's definition adds an important point to the foregoing:

> 'Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, *not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches,* to secure not a reduced, but a transformed Christianity.'

Modernism, then, represents the attempt to adjust our traditional theology to the new learning without loss to the ancient religion. Some would say that it is the attempt to be

[2] The Macmillan Co., New York, 1922.

both reasonable and religious, but this may easily give the impression that Modernism is a facile and shallow compromise by which both religion and reason suffer loss. But a compromise it most certainly is not.

We have noted already that Modernism is not a system, but an orientation. This orientation is the product of certain convictions. Of these, perhaps the most important is that the static conception of the Universe is false. Rapidly accumulating evidence, scientific and historical, indicates that we are in the midst of a vast process of which we are both products and factors. As a Christian the Modernist believes that this process is essentially rational, moral and spiritual. He has faith that in the end, notwithstanding many present appearances to the contrary, this fundamentally Christian conviction will be able to justify itself to every rational, moral and spiritual creature. Further, he believes that the evolutionary process is essentially creative: it is bringing new realities into existence as it advances. But it must be insisted that to be an evolutionist is not to be tied down to a mechanical view of the Universe. The Modernist does not regard the Universe as a machine which either imprisons or excludes God, for closely bound up with his acceptance of Evolution is his belief in the progressive unveiling of the Divine Nature and Will by the operation of the Spirit of God in human personality. That unveiling he believes to be, to use St. Paul's phrase, 'in Christ,' and its agent the Spirit which was in Christ. Hence he believes that this progressive revelation by the Spirit can offer no contradiction to the revelation given through Jesus Christ, although he does expect that it will expand and extend that revelation. The words in the Fourth Gospel: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; but when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all truth,' are to the Modernist prophetic of this progressive revelation of the Spirit, and he is convinced that it is to this progressive revelation, rather than to the actual words of Scripture, or to the formulations of ecclesiastical tradition, that the Church should be loyal.

Because the Modernist is a believer in the truth, he not only holds that truth is great and that it will prevail; that with Bacon

the search for truth is one of the most enthralling and ennobling of occupations; but also that it is a serious duty to be as truthful as we can, and especially in our religious teaching and services. Here, at any rate, the word should be made to correspond as closely as possible to reality and actuality. He feels it to be a moral obligation to secure the acknowledgment of this principle —that it is the duty of the Christian Church both to affirm belief in the continuous character of the Divine Revelation and also, even at some risk of being charged with inconsistency, to acknowledge her obligation to re-state her beliefs and re-interpret her formularies in harmony with this progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.

The Church's loss of influence owing to the belief that she is behind the times; that Christianity is out of date; that religion and science are in opposition; that Church dogmas are 'obsolete and no longer nourishing'; that her plans of salvation are stereotyped; that her 'crystallized and petrified orthodoxies' are now largely empty of meaning; are all due to the Church's failure to realize the progressive character of the Divine Revelation and the necessity for adaptation of the Church's message to the knowledge and needs of the age.

Hence the Modernist attaches the highest importance to contemporary research and discovery, contemporary movements and ideals, as being means by which the Spirit is making known the Divine Will. It is this which has led a writer in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* to define a Modernist as 'one who esteems his own age above antiquity,' and has tempted an Anglican critic of Modernism to aver that the Modernist's Bible is the latest edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* But the Modernist does not despise what has gone before, nor does he ignore it. There is no more diligent student of history, because he knows that without a knowledge of the past we cannot perceive the trend of the world process, understand the present, or visualize the future; and it is this knowledge of the past which forbids him to say at any point, *Ci j'y reste.* The *Tonus peregrinus* is for ever sounding in his ears: the staff and scrip of him who has no abiding city is in his hand: his face is set forward and not backward. Those who desire a static condition, and complain of the Modernist's mobility, ought rather to lay their com-

plaint at the throne of Him who has placed us in an evolutionary and not a static Universe.

This does not mean that the Modernist's dominant view of life is that of a problem in a Universe which is a riddle, but that his own life and the life of the Church appear to him to be a growing experience, and that those who live in an environment which is changing will do well to practise that power of adaptation on which the maintenance of vitality depends.

To the Modernist's belief in evolution, his belief in the supreme value of truth, his belief in the need for the Church to realize the progressive character of the Divine revelation, must be added his belief in the necessity for freedom. St. Paul wrote, 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty': and the inference is that where there is not liberty, there the Spirit of the Lord is not.

This conviction of the value of freedom compels the Modernist to separate the ideal of Church unity from that of ecclesiastical uniformity. The unity of the Church cannot, he feels, be based on uniformity of organization, uniformity of worship, uniformity of creed. Unity secured in this way cannot be satisfactory, because it is secured at the cost of freedom, and will be found also to be secured at the expense of truth and progress. Real unity must be based on a common adoration, a common moral ideal, a common love and loyalty of members to their Head, to each other, and to the body of which they form part: a unity which is not uniformity and is not detrimental to freedom. The Church must strive after this. The re-union of Christendom is not possible until it is achieved. Tinkering treaties between jarring sects, based on the ideal of uniformity of organization, dogma, and rite, are not going to meet our need, although they may have a temporary popularity with ecclesiastical diplomats. Until Christendom is baptized into the Spirit of Progress, Freedom, Truth and Love, we shall secure no Christian re-union worth having.

For in addition to the Spirit of Progress, Truth and Freedom, there is—more important than them all—the Spirit of Love. The Church should form the home for the cultivation of that Spirit. It is here that the Modernist differs from the Protestant. He abhors individualism and he abhors schism.

He believes that the discipline of love, and all those qualities of patience, consideration for others, tolerance, sympathy and mutual service are developed best, not by leaving a body which is not in complete harmony with us, but by living in it and living for it. Moreover, the Modernist regards it as essential to the influence of the Christian Church that it should be comprehensive and many-sided—and these qualities are only secured by the elimination of the spirit of schism, which is only an intolerant individualism. It is this Catholic temper which leads the Modernist to value historical continuity so highly. He has no desire to pull down and abolish the old, but to adapt it to modern needs. He would treat the Church as a cultured man would treat an ancient house which he had inherited. The exterior, with its venerable and picturesque appearance, would remain unchanged, but modern drains, lighting, heating and bath-rooms would replace more primitive arrangements. The Modernist is not a revolutionary: he does not want drastic and destructive change. With Pascal, he believes that it is in the soul that things happen; and it is the soul of the Church, its thinking, willing, feeling, its whole spirit and outlook, which he wants to see renovated. Like John the Baptist, he would begin by preaching μετάνοια—a complete change of heart and mind.

The ideals of Modernism enable us to see what are the functions it may perform. Modernism is essentially a Gospel of Reconciliation. It seeks to reconcile faith and fact: to reconcile the Church's doctrine with the new outlook which our modern research in science, history, literature and psychology have brought about. It promises also to achieve a much to be desired synthesis between Catholicism and Protestantism. The Modernist realizes how much there is to be said for the Catholic ideal of life. True Catholicism is comprehensive and many-sided. Its aim is not to exclude, but to include. It is neither ascetic nor Puritanical. It would not pronounce anything as unclean in itself, but would consecrate everything by using it rightly. It would baptize all knowledge, activity, and culture into Christ. It need hardly be added that much so-called Catholicism, in its narrowness, bigotry, asceticism and obscurantism, is the very antithesis of what Catholicism should be. The Modernist equally honours the principles which have

been the real inspiration of Protestantism—love of freedom and truth; and he sees no reason why these principles should not be fruitfully combined with those of Catholicism. With the advance of the Modernist spirit the conflict between Catholic and Protestant within the English Church will disappear, and we shall get a form of the Christian religion which will unite both ideals. It is this function of reconciliation, toleration, unification that we may look to Modernism to achieve.

Another function of Modernism will be the simplification of dogma. The affirmations of the moral and spiritual life need only be very few. Our dogmas are too many and too complicated. They are a frequent cause of misunderstanding and dispute. They are oftentimes an *incubus* instead of a help. The Modernist would simplify the whole dogmatic situation by urging Christian teachers to keep the three following distinctions in view:

(1) The distinction between Religion and Theology. *Religion* is the feeling which we have towards God, its cultivation and growth, the inner experience which it gives us. *Theology* is the intellectual expression of that feeling in the form of propositions. In consequence a man may be deeply religious and know nothing of theology, and know much of theology and be utterly devoid of religious feeling. But religion is the primary thing: theology is merely secondary. When the subordinate position of theology is realized, it becomes much easier to bring it into harmony with religious experience, and to do this is to simplify it greatly, for many of the distinctions which the intellect makes in the realm of theology have no value or even existence in the sphere of religious experience, and so must eventually be discarded.

(2) The second distinction is between *faith* and *belief*. Faith is trust in a person: belief is assent to propositions. Faith directed towards God as unveiled in Jesus Christ is central for the Christian religion. To make that constant and courageous endeavour which the Christian religion demands is impossible without faith. But assent to a number of propositions is a very different matter. The more faith we have, the greater the mountains we can remove; the more propositions we believe, the less we are likely to achieve, for they will

probably blur our outlook and possibly paralyse our will. A reduced Christianity is not a Christianity with only a few articles in its creed, but a Christianity which is weak in faith and courage and good works.

(3) The third distinction is between the spiritual realities to which Christian doctrines witness, and the forms which these realities assume in men's minds in particular ages : between the *fact* and the *mode*. In the Christian religion the fact is the eternal reality : the mode may be a temporary and mutable expression of it, and frequently it is essential to distinguish them if Christian faith is not to seem to be contradictory to Christian reason. We no longer believe, *e.g.* that Christ will literally descend on the clouds of heaven at some great Last Day, that the graves will open and the dead rise at that coming. This is only a pictorial mode of expressing the spiritual fact that the moral and and spiritual standards revealed by Christ are the standards by which we are judged day by day, and that our future destiny and usefulness depend on our striving to conform to those standards here and now. And the same principle applies to many other Christian doctrines. The fact is essential, the mode non-essential. As simplification of creed is needful in the interests both of Christian Re-union and Christian Comprehensiveness, so the Modernist distinction between fact and mode is of great value as a first step towards simplification. Whilst the Modernist rightly declines to declare that men are saved by their conduct and character apart from their creed (because he knows that creed and conduct, and creed and character, are closely related, and that in the end conduct is the outcome of creed, as character is the outcome of conduct) yet he deprecates the recitation of creeds which reflect old controversies rather than living issues. *How* a man believes is of even more importance than *what* he believes, for his conduct reacts upon and alters his belief. The Modernist is convinced that much of our Church troubles are due to the idea being sedulously propagated that to be a Christian is to assent to a certain number of propositions, rather than to be a person marked out by the possession of a particular spirit and type of character, and known by his acting up to a certain moral standard in difficult situations.

The Modernist is sure that until the Church will put first things first; seek to obey the present guidance of the Holy Spirit more than the ancient letter or the mediaeval tradition; be more anxious and strenuous to promote the Kingdom of God on earth than to secure her own interests; value truth and fearlessness, comprehensiveness and moral energy more than what are commonly regarded as 'correct' views, there is little prospect of the triumph of that new and greater Reformation which the Christian Church so greatly needs and without which it must become increasingly a congeries of futile sects.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's.

> 'God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' II. Cor. iv, 6.

THIS address is, as you know, the first of a course of sermons to be delivered in this church under the auspices of the Churchmen's Union. I want you to understand that these sermons have not been arranged in order to demonstrate that we are less unorthodox than some people suppose us to be, still less that we are meditating an attack upon traditional Christianity. Please consider us rather as a group of friends who think that they have a positive and constructive message, not quite on the most familiar lines, and who hope that they may be able to help some of the younger generation who find it increasingly difficult to reconcile the old faith with the new knowledge. You will not find that we all say quite the same things; but we are all earnest Christians, and I do not think that we shall trouble or unsettle anybody.

I have chosen as the title of my address the question, 'What is Christianity?' It is the title of a famous series of lectures by Harnack, which all ought to read. But I shall not follow his treatment, which does not altogether satisfy me. This representative Liberal Protestant is strong where the Liberal Catholics are weak, and weak where they are strong.

I wish it were easier than it is to combine the merits of these two schools, while excluding their defects.

A student of comparative religion might answer the question, 'What is Christianity?' in some such language as the following: 'Christianity is the name of the religion of the white race. It began indeed on Semitic soil, as a reforming movement within Judaism. But as a distinct religion it belongs essentially to the Graeco-Roman culture, and very quickly lost touch with Asiatic and Semitic modes of thought. In less than three hundred years it had made the conquest of the Roman Empire, and has never since been seriously challenged in the nations which inherited the classical tradition. Asia, on the other hand, reverted in the seventh century to a genuinely Oriental religion, and the Jews remained faithful to their old national traditions. Like other great religions, Christianity has found room for every type of piety, and has been professed by men and women of the most widely divergent characters. It would not be an easy task to find a least common denominator for Origen, Simeon Stylites, Francis of Assisi, Ignatius of Loyola, Archbishop Laud, Oliver Cromwell, George Fox, John Wesley, Madame Guyon, Dr. Pusey, General Gordon, Frederick Denison Maurice, and Father Damian. What formula could include the Catholic, who believes that the Divine Grace is normally mediated only by the Sacraments, and the Quaker, who dispenses with Sacraments altogether?'

All this is very true, and it is right to remember that the religion of the Spirit, like some chemical substances, is never found pure, but only in combination with other elements. Christianity, as a great fact in history, is part of the civilization of Europe, and is thoroughly entwined with that civilization as a whole. Those who predict its disappearance are hardly less shallow than those who thought that the Russian Communists might succeed in their attack upon the Family, Religion, and Private Property, the three strongest instincts in human nature. Religions do not die. Even the death of the Olympian gods was mainly the result of the complete racial decay of their worshippers. The Greek and Roman gods disappeared when there were no more Greeks or Romans. As for the various Hellenistic cults which competed with Christianity, they failed

because they had no historical basis. But to a large extent, they were rather absorbed than destroyed. The *nomina*, not the *numina*, were changed.

But when we ask, 'What is Christianity?' we want a different kind of answer. We want to know, not what Christianity has been in history, but what it is in essence. Christianity claims to be a Divine revelation. It claims to be the absolute religion. What is the kernel of Christianity, for which these great claims can reasonably be made?

First of all, Christianity is a historical religion, which is built upon the foundation of a historical Person, who lived in Palestine in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. Till lately, this was admitted by all, and in a sense it must be admitted by all. It is as much insisted on by Seeley in *Ecce Homo*, by Matthew Arnold in *Literature and Dogma*, and by Harnack in *What is Christianity?* as by the most orthodox of traditionalists. It is only in the present century that a party has arisen within the ranks of professing Christians, which in the words of its ablest spokesman, Alfred Loisy, speaks of 'as it were two Christs,' the Jesus of History and the Christ of the Church. You know probably the general lines of this new apologetic. It accuses the Liberal Protestants of being half-hearted in their criticism, and of turning a Jewish peasant into a nineteenth century German or English moralist. The Jesus of history, they say, was one of several Messiahs or Mahdis who appeared about this time. Some of them were revolutionists, like Theudas and Judas of Galilee; others were Apocalyptists, who proclaimed that the Kingdom of God was shortly to be set up in Palestine by supernatural means. To the latter class belonged Jesus of Nazareth. He preached repentance and amendment of life; but this was not the essence of his message, which consisted in the proclamation of the approaching end of the age, which never came. At last, according to Loisy, he conceived the crazy idea of a *coup d'état* at Jerusalem, and went to the capital, 'not at all because he expected to die there.' The attempt, says the French critic, 'could only end in a miracle or in a catastrophe, and it was the catastrophe which happened.' On the basis of this tragic and half-insane career was reared the structure of a cult resembling those of

Osiris and Mithra, the worship of a dying and rising Saviour God, with whom his worshippers held communion by sacraments. So the Catholic Church came into being, and the instinct of self-preservation prompted and accounts for all its later developments.

The Roman Church, very properly in my opinion, ejected Loisy; but he has a few well-known disciples in the Anglican Communion. I will not stop to discuss the singularly perverse handling of the Gospel history which I have summarised. But I wish to insist that the Christian Church never did belong to that type of religion which was so popular in Hellenistic times —the worship of a non-historical dying and rising Saviour God. The Christians knew this type of religion, and would make no terms with it. From the very first, Christian apologetic rested on the Gospel history as history, and as for the contention that St. Paul preached a crude, unethical sacramentalism, it is simply untrue, as anyone can see for himself by reading the Epistles. Can we suppose that the Pagans would have classed the Christians with the Epicureans as 'atheists,' if their worship had been at all like a type of religion with which they were quite familiar?

I will go further and say that every Christian revival, from the days of the early Church to our own, has inscribed on its banner, 'Back to the historical Christ.' And nearly all the Christian mystics have turned the gaze of adoration on that human figure. I do not think that a religion can change its type completely. To separate the Christ of worship from the Jesus of history is to sever the tree from its roots. I am really glad that these Modernists should pour scorn on the Liberals, as they do. We are no more desirous of being mixed up with them than they with us.

We hold fast, then, to a historical Incarnation in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. But what do we mean by an Incarnation?

It seems to me that many Christians approach the Divinity of Christ from the wrong end. They assume that they know the chief attributes of God, and then they claim that Jesus Christ possessed these attributes. Omnipotence, omniscience, power to suspend the order of nature—these are some of the

Divine attributes which men have wished to ascribe to the Incarnate Son. But surely the purpose of the Incarnation was to make known to men what God is. And that revelation is the most tremendous, amazing, and blessed revelation ever made to the human race. The whole of the Old Testament is taken up with the problem of the justice or righteousness of God. 'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?' men asked, and many solutions were tried, for they could not acquiesce in a negative answer. They hoped also that God is merciful. But that the very God should reveal himself in the likeness of a poor, persecuted preacher of righteousness—that in this form He should suffer and die for mankind—truly this was for the Jews a stumbling-block and for the Greeks foolishness, but for the whole human race the best of good news. 'God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him.' So, eighty years later, the meaning of the Incarnation and Passion was summed up.

God has revealed Himself in nature as Power and Beauty; but only in the Incarnation and Passion has He revealed Himself as Love. And could that revelation have been made in any other way than by the personal Incarnation of the Divine Logos, through whom the worlds were made, and who sustains them in being? 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.' '*Sic Deus dilexit mundum*'—it is the text engraved over the high altar in my Cathedral. It commemorates the voluntary self-abasement of a fully Divine Being, for the redemption of mankind by self-chosen suffering. This is the offence and the glory of the Cross. And it is the loving and suffering Son of God, the crucified Lord of Glory, who has drawn all men to Him. He has drawn all men to Him because in the Cross the sting of the world's suffering has been taken away. Since the Incarnation and Passion we know, if we believe that Jesus Christ was and is what the Church holds Him to be, that the law of love, the law of sacrifice, the law of gain through pain, of victory through defeat, is the law of God's world, not the law of a world from which God has been banished, or which He is unable to mould to His will. This, it seems to me, is what we mean first and foremost, when we say that we believe in the Divinity of Christ. The doctrine is

a doctrine about God; it tells us something about the spiritual laws of life, under which, as God's creatures, we have to live.

No doubt, if these extreme, and as I hold perverse, critics were right, and the historical Jesus was only a simple-minded enthusiast, utterly ignorant of the forces opposed to Him, all would not be lost. We should still believe that there was a great awakening of spiritual life under the early Empire, a diffused revelation which cannot be focussed in the career of any individual. We could still believe that Christian ethics are the best, and we could still find in the religious philosophy of Plato and his school, from whom the Church borrowed so much, a light by which we could walk. In the absence of some divine revelation, as Plato said himself, there is a raft on which we may hope to navigate the dangerous waters of life without disaster. All would not be lost. But, speaking for myself, I should feel that a great part of the joy and radiance had vanished from my faith. Could we any longer say, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' if we could not add with the apostle, 'Thanks be to God, Who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ'?

'*Conversio fit ad Dominum ut Spiritum.*' Yes, the warning against what has been called 'Jesus-worship' has some justification. It is a living, spiritual Christ Whom we worship. But still our sheet-anchor is, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' The Spirit of God, the guest of the pure in heart, is still, as He is called in the Acts of the Apostles, 'the Spirit of Jesus.' Christian prayer, and all the Christian mysticism which is only Christian prayer at its greatest intensity, has always been deeply coloured by what God has told us about Himself through the Christ of the Gospels. There is a profound truth in what St. Augustine in the Confessions says of even the best philosophy apart from the Incarnation. 'The Word made flesh, that found I not among them'—the philosophers.

This then is part of our answer to the question, 'What is Christianity?' It is the revelation of God as Love, made in the Person of the Word of God made flesh and tabernacling among us.

But this revelation necessarily affects our whole lives. There is a distinctive Christian view of the world, which follows

upon what we believe of the God who made the world. Our whole valuation of life, our estimate of the relative importance of all that makes up our experience, is and must be determined by what Christ has taught us about God. We learn partly from the discourses in the Gospel, such as the Sermon on the Mount and the Parables, and partly from the character of the human Christ as it is described in the Gospels. And here I would recommend you to read, if you have not done so, Dr. Glover's book, *The Jesus of History*. I will not commit myself to agreement with every page of it, but it does seem to me to be a triumphant refutation of the notion that we know very little about the actual character of Jesus Christ. The author brings out very successfully the entire consistency of the words of Christ with His actions, and shows that we have in the Gospels a graphic picture of a perfect character, lived in accordance with definite principles and beliefs. I could not, at the end of a sermon, attempt to sum up this character; you had better read the Gospels again for yourselves with this object in your minds. You will notice, doubtless, the *inwardness* of the Gospel: from within, out of the heart of man, proceed all things that exalt and all things that defile the character; you will notice the very slight importance of all the accessories, the paraphernalia of life, and of worship too; our Lord's hatred of hypocrisy, hard-heartedness, and worldliness; His hopefulness in dealing with characters that were merely disreputable; His individual sympathy and fellow-feeling for all sorts and conditions; His indignation with those who lay unnecessary burdens on men's shoulders, hindering them from bearing His easy yoke and light burden—that easy yoke and light burden which, nevertheless, meant life-long self-denial and might mean a martyr's death; these are only some of the characteristics of Christ's teaching; and they all belong to a definite and distinctive view of life, which St. Paul calls 'the mind of Christ.' The mind of Christ—that is Christianity.

Let me beg you, then, to concentrate your attention on these two things—the revelation of the nature and character of God as revealed in the face of Jesus Christ, and the view of life which necessarily follows if we believe the words, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Do not be misled by the now popular catchword that Christianity is social, not indi-

vidual. Christ began with the individual and worked outwards. He did not criticise the Roman method of taxation; he called Levi and reformed Zacchaeus. He did not agitate for a better treatment of the 'unmarried mother'; He reclaimed the woman that was a sinner, and bade the adulteress sin no more. His Good Samaritan lent his own beast, and gave his own twopence; he did not run after the Priest and Levite and take their purses, which seems to be the modern version of the parable. We have to save our own souls, not in order to have a good time in the next world, but because that is the task that God has given us to do, and because we help our neighbours by what we are much more than by what we do.

Try to get a clear idea of what Christianity as a rule of life means. It is a principle which, if men would only really believe in it and live by it, would turn the world into a very creditable imitation of heaven. There are no social evils which it could not cure, and no human troubles in which it could not bring comfort. 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' This is Christianity.

THE BIBLE

By the Rev. E. W. BARNES, Sc.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'—II. Cor., iii, 17.

FOR English Churchmen the Bible is the supreme authority in matters of faith.

> 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.'

Such is the carefully-worded statement of the Sixth of those Articles of Religion which define the doctrinal position of the English Church. You will notice that this statement does not assert that the Bible is free from errors of fact. By it we are not committed to the view that different books do not in places contradict one another. Nothing whatever is said as to the value of the history or science of the Bible: its religious value alone is affirmed: it contains all things necessary to salvation. Moreover, the statement implies that even in

matters of doctrine the Scriptures are not always decisive. Some dogmas have to be proved by, that is to say, deduced by, argument from Scriptural statements. But we are not bound by any doctrine which cannot be proved by Scripture. The Reformers, for instance, contended that the three creeds of the Prayer Book were to be accepted and believed, because they 'may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' They rejected the fiction that the Church possessed unformulated traditions, not contained in the New Testament, which were derived from Christ and His apostles. They refused to accept even the authority of General Councils of the Early Church. Such Council sometimes

> 'Have erred even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.'

Finally, traditions and ceremonies can be modified from time to time, 'so that nothing be ordained against God's Word.' Yet, though every particular Church may change or abolish ceremonies or rites, the individual must be loyal to the usages of the Society to which he belongs.

This summary of the Anglican position is taken from the Articles of Religion to which our clergy at their ordination must still subscribe. I put it before you to show how absolutely central the Bible is in our authoritative scheme of faith. It is well known that the other Reformed Churches in Great Britain attach an equal, if not a greater, importance to the authority of the Bible. As we reflect upon these facts we understand the force of the old saying, 'The Bible is the religion of Englishmen.'

'Yes, indeed,' I can imagine some of our people complaining, 'but it is men like yourself, who sympathise with scientists and higher critics, who have destroyed the authority of the Bible. You and your like are responsible for the disastrous decay of faith, with its alternatives of scepticism and superstition, which we find in England to-day.'

How shall I meet this charge? Let me say at once that my faith is rooted and grounded in the Bible. I accept without reservation the authority of Scripture as I have outlined it in the quotations from our Articles just put before you. In the Bible I find God's witness to Himself, all that I can know

of His revelation in Jesus Christ to mankind. The Bible gives me all the great principles of religion, all the spiritual truths, that I need. I find there supreme religious inspiration. I hold that the Christian faith must be built upon the teaching of the Bible, that its development can be rightly fostered only by a fuller and truer understanding of Holy Scripture. The purity of Christian worship, belief and conduct is endangered whenever men add religious ideas and practices for which, when we thoughtfully examine the Bible, we cannot claim Christ's authority or approval. Are we in doubt as to some particular aspect of Christian dogma? Our final court of appeal is the New Testament. Can we justify some particular kind of worship and allied teaching? We must find out whether it is consonant with the mind of Christ as revealed by an intellectual study of the Gospels.

'Ah, but,' the old-fashioned Christian will object, 'there is some trap here, some juggling with words. You do not believe the Bible nor does any scientist or so-called higher critic.'

Frankly, I do not believe that the varied literature which we call the Bible is free from error. Its science is primitive. For instance, all who wrote in it believed that the earth was the fixed centre of the Universe. The book which stands first in it opens with an account of creation which is incorrect, though the great Hebrew prophets never mention and perhaps did not accept the Genesis views of the origin of the world and man. But what does it matter? We go to the Bible for religious truth, not for anticipations of the results of modern scientific discovery. Of course, if the religious teaching of the Bible were incompatible with the conclusions of modern science, we should indeed be in trouble. But the fact is that the view of God and of his relation to man which we owe in its final form to Christ, combines better with the modern scientific outlook than with early Jewish speculation.

So also with regard to history. Scholars, by discovering and translating the records of Egypt and Babylonia, have given us a new knowledge of the history of the nations surrounding Israel. At the same time analysis of the earlier Hebrew Scriptures has shown that in them early documents and traditions were welded together with much other material at a somewhat late date. We have thus come to realize that the growth of

true religion among the Jews was a slower and more gradual process than we had thought. But none the less it remains an amazing phenomenon. From the most unpromising beginnings, from tribal cults vindictive and immoral, there arose ethical monotheism: the knowledge that there is one God, Creator of the Universe, and that He is righteous. The religious significance of the historical books of the Old Testament has been enhanced by the new discoveries. In their present form they give idealized history. But, again, what does it matter? We go to the Bible for religion: if it was merely an accurate text-book of the history of Semitic tribes which lived between Assyria and Egypt we should ignore it.

'But,' say those who cling to old views, 'the Bible is either true or false. Your higher criticism destroys its trustworthiness. If we cannot believe that Moses wrote the Book of Deuteronomy, how can we believe that Jesus ever lived?' This objection rests upon a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the Bible and a wholly groundless fear of the consequences of modern study of Scripture. The higher criticism is often spoken of as if it were a subtle and evil device of the devil. In reality it is nothing but a way of getting a better understanding of ancient documents. It is commonsense developed by study of the growth of language and by antiquarian research, strengthened by careful comparison and by infinite patience: commonsense elevated to an exact science. It is a means of reaching truth. Men dislike it merely because the truth which it reveals does not accord with their prejudices. It destroys false ideas of the nature of Holy Scripture. So men who have these wrong notions think that it must be wholly destructive; and fear produces blind hatred.

Let me admit that there was a time when I was troubled as to what might be the outcome of scientific study of the New Testament. I was never perturbed by the so-called quarrel between religion and science. I was brought up to accept the biological doctrine of evolution just as everyone now accepts Copernican astronomy; and I have never been able to see why the fact that the Biblical writers held neither of these scientific truths was of any importance to my faith. Moreover, I have never been troubled by the knowledge that in the Old Testament we have poetry, allegory, drama, myth. The Old Testa-

ment is a small library in which are to be found all the most valued books of pre-Christian Judaism. I value the Book of Daniel none the less because I know that it is a religious allegory. Any one of you who has been inspired by *Pilgrim's Progress* will smile at the objection that it can have no value because it is not true. If stories cannot teach or inspire, of what use were the parables of Christ? But there was a time when I wondered—it was very foolish—whether faith in Christ and the revelation of God which came through Him would survive an accurate investigation of the Gospels and Epistles. It actually seemed credible that it might be proved that the religious insight of Christendom had been wholly at fault, that men had invented, as a sort of religious symbol, Jesus of Nazareth! I now see that we know more of our Lord than ever before. I can now begin to appreciate His greatness because I can better realize the effect which He had on His disciples. The personality of His various biographers and interpreters has become more clear. Their mentality no longer obscures Jesus now that we can with considerable accuracy separate His teaching from accretions. He has become, in one way, more natural, more human; but in His moral perfection and spiritual certainty, in the amazing unity of His uniquely rich inner life and outward conduct, He reveals Himself as uniquely the Son of God. The idea that He never lived is merely ludicrous. The idea that He was half-fanatic, half-idealist, made by the growth of pious legend into the centre of a religious cult, will not bear examination. Modern study of the New Testament enables us to trace efforts made by His followers to explain Him; and as we do so we find ourselves compelled to accept the miracle of the Resurrection. At first, by the disciples at Jerusalem, Jesus is pictured simply, objectively, as the Holy and Righteous One, the man sent from God, the Messiah of Jewish expectations, Who had risen from the dead. Then St. Paul carries on Christian interpretation as the realization that He will be the Redeemer of humanity becomes more clear. The Spirit of God dwelling with men, the source of moral and spiritual progress, is for the Apostle the Spirit of the risen and exalted Christ. And finally, in the Fourth Gospel, the philosophy of the age is used to explain the timeless, universal significance of the Galilean artisan Who was, and is, and shall remain, the

greatest Figure in human history. The Bible that really matters to us is the Bible which has been, it is hardly too much to say, discovered by modern scholars. In a very real sense it is the old loved book, for accurate investigation has merely confirmed true religious instinct. This Bible stretches from Amos to St. John. It begins with the eighth-century Hebrew prophet who first saw that the God of the whole earth is righteous. It takes us through the centuries when men dreamed of the coming of a Kingdom of Righteousness and when an unknown exile in Babylon realized the redemptive power of innocent suffering. It shows us a period of waiting when worship became increasingly formal, when the shrewd worldliness of Proverbs, the scepticism of Ecclesiastes and the painful thought of Job mirrored human perplexity. Then came Jesus of Nazareth, last and greatest of the Prophets, fulfilment of Messianic hopes, despised and rejected of men, crucified, dead and buried, but still the central hope of humanity. And Paul preached redemption through faith and service which joins men in a brotherhood of the spirit to Him. And some Jewish visionary in superb imagery pictured a new heaven and a new earth made by the power of His Spirit. And, last of all, the writer of the Fourth Gospel, with matchless insight, revealed Jesus as the Light and Life of men, Whom to know is life eternal.

Can it be possible that when modern scholarship gives us such a Bible we can despise the gift? Surely we ought to thank God for our spiritual freedom. We are no longer enthralled by petty superstitions. We have done with tedious and tiresome casuistry based on isolated texts. The Bible is something far greater than a handbook of theology. It is the record of a great movement, unequalled for moral and religious value in the history of humanity: and we get the record, not smoothed out in some sleek history, but in great rough fragments. Often enough we ask in vain: What did the prophet really think? What did Christ really do or say on this particular occasion? What mental process led to this or that statement or argument in Gospel or Epistle? Often enough we find in the Bible traces of what we now deem superstitions, the influence of popular fancies of no permanent value. All this is natural, just what we should expect, for the Bible shows us the

Revelation of God, not in some perfect scheme of abstract thought, but in the writings of men buffeted by the storms of life and baffled by human limitations as they tried to understand God's nature and purpose and to explain our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Too often Christian people take this or that novel result of modern study and exaggerate its importance till all sense of proportion is lost. They are like children who cannot see the majestic power of a great river because straws float in petty eddies near its banks. The Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, preparation in the Old Testament, fulfilment and consequence in the New—such is the Bible's message. Mankind cannot do without that message. Wo do not like it because of its moral sternness. We constantly ignore it with disastrous results. We may turn to other religious interpretations of human life, and they are inadequate. We combine the Christian message with all sorts of half-truths and superstitions, and dissatisfied turn again to Christianity, pure and simple—to the God of Love, our Father, reached by prayer, served by purity, righteousness and truth, and to His only Son, Jesus of Nazareth, Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven.

I wish that I could convey to you the sense of freedom, joy and victory which the new knowledge of the Bible gives. There has been for Christians nothing like it since the great Humanists of the Renaissance felt that they had escaped from the shackles of medieval Scholasticism. Men like Erasmus and Colet saw that Christianity was not some rigidly-enclosed scheme of thought, fashioned by ingenious subtlety that professed literal subservience to Scriptural texts. It was to them a gift of the Spirit of God, congruous with all that is finest in human thought and endeavour. The Church had dictated, as Catholicism still presumes to dictate, the conclusions which men must reach. It preserved things good and things bad; it protected faith and superstition; and, under its moral authority, moral degeneration was widespread. The Christian Humanists of the Renaissance captured over again that glorious liberty of the Sons of God of which St. Paul speaks. The mind of man resumed its onward march, independent of the Church, nominally independent of Christ, but always instinctively turning to Him for moral guidance and religious inspiration. Had the freedom

with which Luther treated the Bible been preserved and developed by the Reformed Churches, many a futile antagonism between progressive culture and Christian opinion would have been avoided. Christians would have had to fight, as they will always have to fight, against non-Christian schemes of thought and conduct. But they would not have wasted their energies in fighting battles which they deserved to lose because the Holy Spirit of freedom and of truth was with their opponents. Unfortunately the successors of the Reformers ended by accepting traditional estimates of the Bible. They built a new Scholasticism which in this country finally collapsed half a century ago. At length, however, the way is open for us to inherit the promise of the Renaissance, to combine the Gospel with modern knowledge. When men see Christ free from a tangle of insincerities and superstitions they will take Him as their leader. To-day for the most part Catholics and Protestants alike cling with deplorable tenacity to obsolete ideas. They need to learn that freedom and truth are essential to religion, and they need to abandon the fear that Christ can ever vanish from the world which His Spirit still redeems.

THE INCARNATION

By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Ephesians I, 9 and 10.

I WILL not read out either the pregnant Greek or the sonorous word for word equivalents of our English versions, for I am sure you would not catch the meaning of the passage if I did. For St. Paul first of Christians, Jesus was the central fact in history, Jesus crucified and risen; Jesus a Man born of woman, yet the Son of the love of the Father-God, representing to men that God who was in Him reconciling the world to Himself. And under the stress of this conviction St. Paul pours out to us here his philosophy of History in terms of the will and purpose of God. He has none of our modern knowledge to help or to hinder him. He knows enough of man and his history; and there is God. There was always Man and

God; but now there is Jesus too. And now he knows both Man and God as they were never known before. Jesus is the key to the solution of the mystery, the intellectual and the moral mystery, of the world. Jesus is entirely new. It is a new God and a new Man. And yet both were from the beginning.

What he says is this :—That there has been a scheme, a plan, a purpose from before the foundation of the world running through all the ages. He says, that provision was made for the accomplishment of this purpose in due course when the time for it was ripe. The meaning of the whole cosmic process of things-in-the-heavens and things-on-the-earth was to be concentrated, gathered together, summed up, as men could understand and see it, in a Person. This purpose of the long life-history of mankind and his environment was made plain in Jesus Christ: He was the crown, the climax, the supreme achievement, from the point of view of the long series of the times in which this purpose of the world was worked out.

If we speak as men, as we must, what a daring experiment it was, as the author of the narrative of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis pictures it—what a daring experiment it was, when God made man in His image, after His likeness, and set him, with all his animal instincts and a will of his own in a world that offers every means for their gratification, to sublimate them all and learn to say 'Not my will, but Thine be done': in virtue of that image of God impressed upon his very being to learn to become such that a man could say of another 'I have seen my brother, I have seen my God.' When you know what primitive man was it is incredible. But there was no time-limit to the experiment. The human animal bore the stamp of the Divine, and at last there was a Man in whom the likeness of God was realized. You would look on Him, you would watch His life and hear His words. Often unconsciously, but now and then of deliberate purpose—for He wanted you to share His secret with Him—He would let you in to His inmost heart and mind, His own ideas and ideals, the source and sustenance of His life, His own most intimate experience. He would live it out and make it real to you: and still more real His spirit would make it when He had died upon the cross. And you would say, Now I know what God is like, and Man. In this God-Man I see the truth of things.

I could wish that everyone to-day who studies seriously our Christian doctrine of the Incarnation would begin with what used to be called the 'Gospel of Creation,' and then pass on at once to the prologue to the Fourth Gospel and St. Paul's descriptions of our Lord as in Himself the accomplishment of the purpose of all things. It is, of course, what to-day we should call an 'evolutionary' theory of God and the world that they set before us. We know much more about man and his history and the amazing capacities hidden in his lowly origin. We know that it was from primitive man that, in Scriptural phrase 'after the flesh,' in their human nature, came an Isaiah, a Plato, Mary His mother, and Jesus Himself. If we believe in the Gospel of Creation and St. John's teaching about the eternal Logos, we say that these things are the outcome of a divine potency inherent in man's constitution, and not needing to be miraculously, as it were, inserted from outside. It was always the 'life' and the 'light' of man, in the high sense in which the evangelist uses the terms.

And with the fuller knowledge of the actual evolutionary process of man's history which we have to-day, we are expressing the Johannine doctrine if we believe that in Jesus 'born of woman' this long process, at once divine and human, reached its goal: what was potential, became actual: a Man was born in whom the likeness of God was realized, and the fact that God is love—the fact that love is the very law of life—was made plain.

In the past these ideas of St. Paul and St. John were nobly used by a few of the greatest thinkers of the Church, but they were never popular, it seems. They were not, perhaps, for the simple and unlearned of the past. For them, as for those like them to-day, the truth of the Christian Faith is grasped more readily in pictures. They think in pictures, and picture-thinking runs through the whole scheme of our Christian doctrines. Life as we know it—the whole history of the universe—is a great Drama, full of incident, scene after scene, transaction after transaction, succeeding one another. It was not the teaching, 'not the Sermon on the Mount, but the whole drama of the Life of Jesus that did the work.' We see the Devil's hand, and we are prone to recognize the finger of God, only when 'things

happen,' not in the slow microscopic processes, but in what we call results. The print must be large to catch the eye.

The print of our doctrine-pictures is large and highly-coloured. So be it. What does it give us as our view of the world and ourselves? First, there is God alone, though God is Father, Son, and Spirit. There is nothing else; God only is without beginning. Pause there, just a moment, to remind yourself that this is not the teaching that Hebrew scholars to-day (like some in the past) find in the three first verses of Genesis. Christians in the past as in the present have held that God must always have had an outward expression of Himself in a world; and the philosopher whose authority is supreme in the Church of Rome to this day declared that it was only on the evidence of Revelation that we could believe the world to have had a beginning.

By the *fiat* of God, then, the world is called into being in stages, the last of which is Man: and all is good. No other has any hand in the making.

Yet neither the world nor Man fulfils the purpose of Creation. The nature of the failure is described in the story of the Fall, all but coincident with the beginning, and the long history is pictured as one of a series of interventions of the Creator-God in various kinds of mediate action, but especially personal action in men chosen out to reveal to others His will.

And at last in the person of the Son—Father and Son agreeing in the supreme self-sacrificing will and action—He comes Himself into the stream of human life, onto the plane of human history, to set right what was amiss with the world—to redeem mankind. 'Thou must love Me who have died for thee.' . . '. . the only begotten Son of God . . . begotten before all worlds . . . very God of very God . . . by whom all things were made; . . for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate.'

Such is the picture. The great experiment in a plurality of personal intelligences, grounded in One supreme Intelligence, but capable of thwarting the purpose of the All, had gone wrong. The supreme subject of the whole experience, con-

ceived as till then a spectator of it rather than a sharer in it, comes from afar right into it, and in the short span of a single human life, under human conditions, achieves the purpose, and so makes the achievement possible henceforth for all: because by His achievement the past failure is blotted out and there is a new start for all.

There are not wanting to-day professing Christians who would dismiss this picture of the Incarnation as mythological. But we must reassert the dignity of myth in our attempts to pourtray religious experience. Why should it not form the framework of our expression of what we believe to be the truth of things—our whole system of Christian Doctrine? Does prose or poetry best express the intimate experience of the human heart and the spirit of Man, the deep things of God and of Man?

Long ago Plato laid down the law that the religious myth must be *like* the truth. The story would not be fact in all its details; but if it suggested to the mind a true account of God and man and the relations between them—if it gave what we call to-day a true orientation of life: then it should be allowed in the educational system of the ideal human society.

And it was an Archbishop of Canterbury a few years ago who asked in the controversy raised by Dr. Gore's essay in the Oxford volume *Lux Mundi*, 'May not the Holy Spirit make use of myth and legend?' One need not argue now that it was in myth and legend that writers of the Old Testament, moved by the Holy Spirit, expressed their religious valuation of human history—or again that it is in the dramatic form of vision and voice and incident and transaction that much of the deepest experience of the spirit of man is presented to the mind itself. Why are we to suppose that in giving their accounts of the unique impression that the life and the whole personality of Jesus produced, the writers of the New Testament should have been miraculously precluded from any of those modes of expression of which the terms myth and legend are used? The Archbishop's question about the Old Testament holds good of the New.

When our Lord Himself makes use of this kind of picture-thinking we speak of allegory or parable. It is clear that it

was in the form of vision and voice that much of His own religious experience in His life on earth was presented to His consciousness. When He told the story of the Baptism and the Temptation, He was giving a picture of His experience not merely in a form in which its spiritual significance could be grasped by men of His disciples' mentality, but as He—the subject of it—actually went through it. The heavens were opened to His eyes, and by His ears there was heard the voice. The Devil came, and the three scenes of the drama were enacted, literally, if you like the word, for Him.

I do not suppose that the story of His birth as we know it was told by the Mother of Jesus herself, but she may have had the experience—mothers may know something of it—that the Holy Spirit of Love came down upon her and gave her the holy child. *He was her child.*

The only question for us is—Are these picture-stories *like* the truth?

Is the conception of Incarnation more like the truth than any other that has been devised? God's essence and His very self made manifest, actualized in a human life, in Jesus? *θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ.* How else would you describe it?

'Inspiration' is the only serious competitor of 'Incarnation' as a formula to sum up and describe the fact of Jesus. It was not enough at the beginning, not even in its strongest form, that 'God was with him,' and it is notorious that it will not serve to account for either the Christian Religion or Christian experience. From the position of modern historical research and modern philosophy and science I cannot conceive that anyone can want to substitute the one category for the other, the concept of an inspired man for that of the Son of God incarnate, the God-Man. At least I know of no 'modernist'—if I must use the label—I know of no modernist who does. We leave the category of inspiration to Jews and Mohammedans and all the other Deists wherever they are to be found; for the essential mark of Deism is that the world and man and God are so distinct that God can only act upon the world and man from outside. He can interpose in the world's course in ways which seem to us to violate the order of Nature as He made it, pro-

fessedly the order of His own design; or He can work by suggestion on men, putting into their minds ideas they could never have had, or into their wills purposes of His own. That is Deism.

You can be a very good 'Catholic,' with a staunch Trinitarian creed, and yet be a Deist in heart and mind. Your doctrine of Church and Ministry and Grace and Sacraments may be one that an early pagan could have held. It is 'deistic,' if you believe that there is in the very constitution of reality a chasm between God and Nature and Man; although you superimpose upon that belief the formal creed that once that chasm was bridged in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, pre-existent God made man. It is just the fundamental Deism of much reputed orthodoxy—of much of the Catholic system—that makes its revision to-day so urgent a need from any modernist point of view; and were this the occasion I should wish to plead that it is as urgent a need in the missionary field—of India for example, as it is at home. It is only the Logos doctrine as understood of old that has a chance.

What the modernist, whose interest, as Tyrrell said, is greater in tradition than in Modernity, wants above all else, as I understand the issue, is to let the doctrine of the Incarnation come at last to its own as the symbol of the final, the absolute, truth of things. We would interpret all being, all life, in terms of the Incarnation. The God-Man is 'the master-light of all our seeing.' The 'modernist' of the past may have been as 'deistic' as the ordinary Christian usually has been; he may have held, when everybody else held it, the mechanical theory of the universe and an absentee God which really underlies the idea of occasional special interventions to adjust the mechanism from time to time. But the modernist of to-day has no use for such conceptions. He cannot work even with the old idea of an omnipresent God, when that omnipresent God is thought of (as He usually was) as being Himself outside the process of things.

Dr. Westcott used to say that if it was true that the Logos became flesh, then all that man could learn of 'flesh' (which stands for everything about Nature and Humanity) would contribute to his knowledge of the less known term in the phrase. And so much has been learnt in the last hundred years that

now we have either to leave God altogether out of account, like the French astronomer who had no need for that hypothesis, or else we have to claim Him as the very ground of the whole life-history of the world and man, in some sense—inadequate as language is—the subject of the whole experience. This does not mean any vague pantheistic conception which destroys personality and minimizes evil. Purpose and will are both personal and transcendent. Even we ourselves have consciousness that we do transcend the order in which we live and of which we are part. And if that consciousness is a delusion, we have no kind of clue by which to thread our way through the maze of experience.

When we affirm our faith in Jesus Christ, incarnate Son of God, crucified and risen, and ascended, as the key to all human history; not intruded from outside, but the purposed and realized product of all that had gone before: we are estimating the whole process as designed to lead up to the end which St. Paul described as 'the revelation of the Sons of God,' the perfection of human society for and by and in all its members.

We need to remember that man made God in his own image—he conceived a superior being with instincts and characteristics like his own—before he came to believe, what we believe, that God made man in His image with a view to the end that man should attain to His likeness. Man began very low, but there was that in him from the beginning which could grow to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Jesus Christ.

The picture of God 'coming down' from above, at one historic moment, from the 'beyond' experience, the land of the guessed-at and longed-for, and lo! at last there it is: that picture pourtrays the relation that always exists between Him and mankind.

If you believe in God as at once the ground of all existence and the reservoir and perfection of life and human personality, and the source and power of the good and beautiful and true: and if you believe that these things are the highest; it is always from above, from on high, that these things come and are embodied in a person.

It is only one who leaves God out of the process who can

possibly hold, to-day, the doctrine that some in the past were said to hold, that our Lord was 'from below.'

And note very carefully, I beg you, that this theory does not make Christ the product of His age, but of all the ages that had gone before. And it does not say that Nature, as apart from God—the natural order, the historic or biological process, of the world—conceived as somehow self-existent—could evolve the Godlike.

This Pauline and Johannine theory—this 'modernism'—which we are considering—knows nothing of a world apart from God, nothing of the natural save as the less or more full expression of the supernatural, and nothing of the human save as the partial embodiment of the Divine. How partial we know too sadly well. But what a glorious potentiality is Man.

Let us hear on the subject a strange voice from the past in the days when Christian doctrine was in the making:

'The divine incarnation did not have its beginning in the Virgin, but was before Abraham and before all creation.'

That was the saying of a great champion of the Nicene faith against the Arians.

I quote his words because, whatever he meant by them, the words themselves express the conviction I would commend to you, that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is only fully understood when the whole world is regarded as an expression of God, and the relation between Him and Mankind is conceived as one of inherent and continuous incarnation attaining its highest and full development in the Person of our Lord.

Of course all kinds of problems remain. But in this instance it is certain that the One did create a new race of men, as the early Christians felt themselves to be, with a new consciousness, Godward and manward. It may be difficult to define the typical Christian experience, yet there is no doubt there has been ever since, among those who have come within its range, a new sense of the values of life. And it is just this valuation of life that differentiates the Christian Religion from others.

If we are right in speaking, as we do, of the 'creation' of man at that far-off moment when from the same stock as the anthropoid ape the earliest ancestor of our race was born, without any break in continuity; we must also speak of the new

creation in Christ, when in the last days as they counted them then, One was born into the world who seems to us still to embody the Divine in human life.

A Deist may say that through Him or by Him mankind can find itself and its goal. We Christians of to-day know, as St. John and St. Paul knew, that it is only in Him that we and the world can be saved. For He represents and embodies for us the way, the truth, and the life; and that, as something which is really all the time our own.

'If they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.'

The Incarnation theory not only dignifies life but accounts for the deepest and constant experiences of life as no other theory does. It makes the things of this world things of ethical and spiritual worth, that is to say, of infinite worth: not as ends in themselves but as the only means by which those infinite values can be learnt and attained. It is his own very sense of the 'might be,' the possible, 'the high that proved too high,' that makes man the moral being he is, able to think of himself in the same moment as fallen and capable of redemption. Before there can be 'conviction of sin' there must be the sense of a standard that could have been reached.

The doctrine of the Incarnation, as St. Paul and St. John expound it, explains the facts of religious experience before Christ and after Christ: the sense of sin when the higher in man passes judgment on the lower, the helplessness, and then the new quickening of the will and its redirection under the conviction that the sovereign purpose and power which must triumph is that which is expressed in the crucified and risen and ascended Son of God, who said, He that will save his life shall lose it, and he that will lose it for my sake and the gospel's shall bring it to new life: I am among you as he that serveth: I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.

Anyone who can follow out, who is even trying to follow out, that law of life is realizing in his own person the divine ground and law of his own being. There is that in him that draws him and can be drawn. 'The upward calling of God in Christ Jesus'—there is the heart of Christian Faith and Christian Religion: the essence of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

THE HOLY SPIRIT

By the Rev. CHARLES E. RAVEN, B.D., Rector of Bletchingley, sometime Fellow and Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

'But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.'
—*Acts* i. 8.

IT is not inappropriate that on this Sunday between the Festival of the Ascension and Pentecost we should be asked to think about the person and work of the Holy Spirit. And I need not remind you there is no subject in the whole range of Christian doctrine on which thought is more confused and preaching more uncertain. Nothing is more convincing proof of the value and place of heresy in the promotion of orthodoxy than the record of the history of the clauses in the Creed which deal with the Holy Spirit. There was no controversy about them to speak of. Consequently they were simply adapted by analogy from what had already been applied to the doctrine of the Second Person, and from that day to this thought has never been concentrated upon them: in the doctrine of the Incarnation we have centuries of question and answer to guide us, in this equally grave matter we are left with almost no help save from the Books of Scripture and from the philosophy, the only Christian philosophy which matters for us, the philosophy of the Greek Fathers in the second and third centuries. Anyone who is familiar with the life and thought of the Church in the present day will know how great the confusion is. It has been my privilege for a number of years to act as examining chaplain to one or other of our bishops, and I never set a paper without asking candidates to describe in their own language what they mean by the Holy Spirit. Never yet, out of many dozens, almost hundreds, of papers, have I received a single answer which went beyond the quotation of a few stock texts to prove His Personality (in a tri-theistic sense) or His 'double procession.' There was no realization of the fact that here was an aspect of Christian truth quite vital if we are to meet the needs of the present day, most helpful in form-

ing a link between Catholic orthodoxy and the modern view of the world: any realization of that seemed wholly foreign to their minds.

It is just on this doctrine, I believe, that we may make our faith plain and intelligible to those who are now clamouring, with voices that cannot much longer be denied, for re-statement: those who have been brought up now for nearly four generations under the influence of a time swayed by the great scientific and democratic movements; those, therefore, for whom religion must needs be described in terms of divine immanence and human fellowship, those whose whole vision of God is of God in and through a world, working beneath the age-long processes to some far-off Event, and whose whole concept of mankind is in strong reaction against the individualism of a century ago, who have no use for a religion unless religion is a message of social conduct. The answer to these people is surely contained in the Church's doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity. How can we interpret it?

Frankly, I do not think the interpretation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit will come from those archaeologists who have for many years now monopolized the title of theologian and the teaching of theology. I don't think your textual critics or patristic scholars will help you. It is to the biologist and the psychologist that we must look for further and fuller light on that, as on so many other details of our restatement. If one began to consider, one would see at once how extraordinarily rich these sciences are in suggestion to those familiar with the records of the New Testament and with the records of Scripture. Take the observations of Fabre, the hypothesis of the Neo-Lamarckians and, for example, the philosophy of M. Bergson, and see how every quality of life and the Life-force as interpreted by them suggests an inevitable parallel with that movement of the Holy Spirit which is unveiled for us in the Holy Scriptures. Life steadily permeating, subduing, controlling matter, life always moving towards the steady betterment of type, life often frustrated in its movement, and often seeming to be side-tracked, and yet always evolving fuller and fuller complexities of form; life which acts spontaneously and instinctively in accordance with survival-value. Is not this

close akin to the record of that Spirit which from the first brooded over the waters, which inspired men with glimpses after righteousness, which became articulate in the words of the Prophets, which was manifested in unique fullness in the life and teaching of Jesus, and which since His time has flowed forward in a fuller, freer flood, penetrating all mankind and unifying it into the membership of the great Body which is a being constructed for it?

Yes, there is a parallel, whether the Neo-Lamarckians are right or wrong. And as one who has only dabbled in biological research, and can speak as little more than an amateur, their theory seems to me as plausible as any put forward. Whether right or wrong, they suggest a problem which, so far as I know, has not been adequately dealt with: certainly not dealt with in that courageous book of papers edited by a distinguished member of this University not long ago.[1]

What is the relationship of life to spirit? Are we to describe this parallel movement of life and spirit as an identity or as an analogy? To put the issue in its oft-debated form, are we to say that man contains in himself three elements—body, soul and spirit, as the Greek Fathers said, or are we to describe him with the Latins as of two elements only, body and rational soul? This is a matter of quite fundamental importance upon which one would like to see attention concentrated. One would like to see someone with the requisite biological and psychological knowledge dealing with it and giving us a philosophy of the relationship of the one to the other. It may seem abstract and remote: yet as soon as you begin to deal with theological problems it becomes intensely practical. It affects one's whole attitude towards the possibility of the so-called 'nature miracles' and the legitimacy of prayers for rain.

I can only suggest the problem because I believe help towards it may come from the psychologist, and come quickly. It is true that for the last twenty-five years we have been staying our souls on the hope that psychology would emerge from the experimental stage—that we should have completed and formulated that analysis of personality and its powers and relationships which has been so long and so eagerly awaited, that com-

[1] *The Spirit*, edited by Canon Streeter.

plete result which shall enable us to restate our dogmatic in terms of psychology, to restate it, that is, in terms of personalities and their inter-relationships. As they investigate the fundamental instincts and impulses which make up you and me, as they show us how these instincts are, or at least can be, sublimated under the impulse of a sufficient motive, as they show us how personality flows into personality, giving us a glimpse of that reality of the corporate soul of which every now and then in our lives we become so strikingly conscious, they will, one feels, help us to understand not only the relationship of life and spirit, but the method of God's working, of God's conduct with you and me, the place of what we call inspiration in life, the meaning of prayer, this very doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Well, these are problems with which I, for one, being neither biologist nor psychologist, am quite unable to deal. I only mention the matter because it seems to me that from this line of study our main help is to be found. But in any case the Christian as such, the Christian student, the archaeologist if you like, has much to say and much to contribute. In the first place because he holds still to the doctrine of divine transcendence, which I am perhaps old-fashioned enough to believe is a necessary part of Christian revelation—a necessary part, if this flux and flow of things is to have any religious value at all. But more especially because in the records of the New Testament we have the story of a psychological experience not only unique in kind, but described so as to act for all time as an exemplar, a pattern of the way in which God works in the souls and lives of men and women. And it is with that I want specially to deal this evening. Can we learn from it the conditions of the coming of the Spirit, something of the activities and energies which reveal the Spirit's presence, something in consequence of His nature and relationship to God?

Well, it is an appropriate day to speak on such a subject. You get the preparation. What was it? How were these men and women enabled to receive that power which certainly came upon them, that power which, whatever we may think of the miraculous element, has impressed itself as no other single force has ever impressed itself on the history of mankind? What were the conditions?

Think of those men. They went up to Jerusalem full of hope, partly selfish, consequently always liable to betray. They went up to Jerusalem literally with one eye on their Master and their loyalty to Him, and the other on the reward that should be theirs. They went up self-centred, ambitious, critical one of another. There was yet, says the Fourth Gospel, no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified. They had to be purged of self. They had to be Jesus-centred, they had to be lifted out of themselves by a loyalty which broke down ambition and fear before the spirit could be theirs. And that happened in the tragedy of Calvary when, added to the shame and humiliation at their failure, the bitter grief for the Master they had lost, they had also the sickening humiliation of the knowledge that they had betrayed Him. Whatever you may say of the empty tomb, Easter stands first and foremost for the knowledge that this Jesus was not dead, but living, living as friend and comrade, living though on another plane of life from theirs, no lost leader or dead prophet, but their present Lord. And if Easter stands for that, then surely Ascension, differently as we should describe it with our subtler distinction between mind and spirit, the subjective and the objective, the Ascension surely stands for the recognition that He is not only living, but has for them the value of God: Jesus glorified, veiled in the cloud of glory, the Symbol of the Divine Presence, Jesus on the right hand of the Father. And then because they not only had their own self-seeking burnt out of them by the Cross, but because they had found One utterly lovable and utterly loving, Who was sufficient to represent to them all that they could know or need of the ideal of Deity; then, because of that, they were fitted to experience life in Him, to experience that expansion of personality, if you like to put it so, that liberation which comes when men have got beyond the two tyrants that fetter us—the tyrant of tradition and the tyrant of fear, those twin children of selfishness, and when in consequence they can respond freely and spontaneously and without any let or hindrance from their own double-mindedness, to the influence of the highest, to the Spirit of God.

With that kind of preparation, how did the Spirit manifest itself? I suppose that the first and most obvious of the signs

of the Spirit's presence in these men is to be found by the test of fruits—love, joy, peace, and the rest. It is in conduct, surely, that the Spirit of God shows itself; it is its stress upon morality that differentiates the Christian doctrine from the spiritualistic myths and revelations which attract so many in these days. Not for nothing did the Christians call the Spirit the Holy One. We, to whom 'holy' has become a kind of prefix like saint or doctor, a title of little meaning, are apt to neglect the significance of the epithet, this new significance of holiness, which is selfless love. With that attribute, the attribute of God Himself, they honoured the Spirit which was theirs —the Spirit given to them. 'By their fruits.' That is going to be a searching test if you apply it, say, to the problems of reunion, of denominational differences. How are you going any longer in face of it to regard the gift of the Spirit as constrained by certain rites or formulae or ceremonies? Love, joy, and peace—just so soon as Christian people begin to manifest these things in their lives, just so soon will there cease to be a complaint about empty churches. For all the world wants them; and it is just because we do not show them that men say suspiciously, 'Where is the evidence of the Spirit in you?'

Go deeper than that. Beyond these fruits of conduct lie what we may call the attributes of the Spirit of Truth. See how these Apostles had a new clarity of vision, a new boldness of utterance, so that spontaneously, intuitively almost, they can answer when they are accused, they can grasp the needs or rebuke the follies of the person with whom they are dealing. There is a new sympathy with the needs of others, a new quickness in the response with which they meet those needs. Even in some cases there are definite psychic powers, as when, for example, Agabus senses what shall happen from his touch of Paul's girdle, and when the apostles poured forth, in a language more native than speech, the praises of God.

It is on the psychical and not on the intellectual plane that the Spirit manifests Himself. It seems to me, at any rate, probable that the interpretation put on the speaking with tongues in the Whitsuntide preface to our Communion Service is wholly unsuited both to the evidence of Scripture and to the whole of

what we know of the Spirit. To imagine that it means in 'different languages' is to contradict St. Paul's full treatment of the subject in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where plainly what happened is described as an ecstatic utterance, when men and women for once got beyond this clumsy machinery of syllables and addressed God freely and fully, an utterance which the Idiotes found unedifying, and which the scoffers in the Acts likened to the chatter of men drunk with wine.

And so go deeper yet. How are man's sensibilities thus intensified? Surely because of realizing contact with God, surely because men find in their complete escape from self a oneness with Him in Whom are all things, and can establish communion with Him, and through Him with each other. That is the supreme meaning of the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Love, love to God and love to their fellow-men, a spirit which makes them responsive not only to individual needs, but to that great corporate need by which they steer thousands forward on the passage of their lives. So it is that over and over again in St. Paul, after he has been tempted to use his great gifts for dialectical subtlety, he is, so to speak, suddenly held back by the overwhelming constraint of the need of that body for whose defence he exists, in whose life he, Paul, finds his own life complete. Does it make for the building up of the body of Christ? He must bring his own rather wayward spirit back into touch with God and with God's people; there he could be sure, certain, authoritative, on the ground he takes up. That aspect of the divine which, working in and through you and me, unites us one with another and with God—that aspect perfectly revealed in Jesus Christ and reproducing in us as we yield to His influence something of that likeness of Christ in which we are made —that aspect of Godhead which translates into terms of human life in you and me the yearning of the All-Father's heart, the impulse of the Father's will; these Three are One, each hypostatic and so far distinct, yet one in content of will and nature, one in love.

Well, I think one can verify in oneself this experience of the apostles. The picture of the Spirit which we get in the New Testament, the Spirit given to us as we free ourselves from

ourselves, as we find an object of loyalty to which our hearts go out unswervingly, as we yield ourselves to the influence of it and thereby find our sensibilities quickened—that picture surely is true to the experience of you and me.

Take any concrete case. Let us apply it to one of the everyday doings of our lives. Someone comes to one of you in the deepest distress for your help and advice. Are you flattered by his coming? Are you at once tremendously self-conscious? Or at least does there lurk at the back of your mind a sense that you must really give of your wisest and best? If so, you may speak with the tongue of men and angels, but nothing will happen beyond, perhaps, the production of your own best advice. There will come neither to you nor to him anything larger than the merest human consolation suggests. But if you can spontaneously lose yourself in interest in him and in contact with God, if you, through the divine outgoing of your own personality in response to need, can for the moment escape from yourself altogether, then you will find that instead of dealing with halting and clumsy words and phrases, you are dealing direct with the heart of him with whom you are in contact—the touch of personality on personality—and that through you flows a power of sympathy which you certainly did not know yourself to possess: through you, whether by speech or without speech, that passes, which holds and sustains and renews: through you God works. And there come times in the light of that kind of experience when one seems to realize a glimpse of the vision of mankind as it might be, when this silly blind selfishness of ours is broken down in loyalty to a great ideal, to a great hero, to God, and we become knit almost visibly in the sympathy of the one body, responsive without speech or gesture to the needs and aspirations of that body, and find in the service of that body our own perfect freedom.

There is Paul's vision, and it stands for mankind: the vision of the one Body and the one Spirit, of the knitting together, in love and by love, of you and me and the myriad units which make up mankind, until at last they are compacted to the measure of the fullness of the stature of Jesus Christ, to form the body in which He and His Spirit returning shall reign.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC

By the Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.; sometime Vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town.

'Christians.'—*Acts* xi. 26.

SOME years ago in my large poor parish in London a chimney sweep was dying of sooty cancer of the neck. He was a friend of mine, and I visited him, and I remember one visit shortly before he died. I invite you to come with me to this little bedroom in our slum street, on the ground floor, at the right hand of the door as you go in, and to hear what he said. We began, English-like, with some reference to the weather, then to the children making a noise outside at the window-sill. Then he said: 'Mr. Handley, I want to know if what I says in the middle of the night is a prayer?' I said: 'Well, Grove (we will call him Grove, that was not his name), what do you say?' 'Well, first of all, I ought to tell you, sir, how it hurts when the missis dresses it. It hurts awful, but I never hollers, because, God bless her, I want her to get quick over the job—it's nasty and offensive. So I sets my teeth and never hollers. But that isn't what I wanted to tell you. I wants to know if what I says in the night is a prayer.' 'What do you say, Grove?' 'In the night, when I can't stand it longer, I puts my hand up to the collar of my night-shirt and gives it a lug, and I says *O Lord!* Is that a prayer?' He looked at me wistfully like a man waiting to know the result of a University examination. I answered: 'Grove! I am not Almighty God to judge the prayers of His children, but I think it is as good a prayer as goes up to the great Father's heart from London all night. It is *your* prayer, and the great Father understands and will hear and bless you.' He lay back on the pillow, and the relief that it was a prayer was beautiful.

Now it is really extraordinarily interesting to analyse those two wants of this artless working man, this ignorant man who could not read or write, as he lay there. Two things he wanted, two things the human heart wants, and they are the two Christian values—the two things the Christian religion through the ages has offered to the children of men. What are the two things

the Christian religion has supplied through all its chequered career and endless vicissitudes? First, *Peace with the Eternal.* We want it; you want it. You are among the witcheries of Oxford. Who that comes back to Oxford does not feel the charm, the romance of Oxford? But do these Varsity associations, this Varsity society, this magic of Varsity life—do they satisfy? Do they go to the root? No, there is something else. There is deep, silent, hidden within this nature of mine, of yours, the hunger for the unspeakable, for the Eternal. This eternal within us yearns for the Eternal without, and is restless till it finds there accord and rest. I must have it sooner or later, if I am to be satisfied, peace with the Eternal; as the old Evangelicals said, I must find peace with God. Old Grove wanted that. You see his 'O Lord!' was not a mere cry of pain, he wanted it to be a prayer. He wanted before he entered the grave and gate of death to be on terms with the Eternal. And this it is the distinction of the Christian religion to supply.

What is the other value, the other boon of the Christian religion? *Love for man.* We chop men up into pens—here are shoeblacks, here grocers, here lawyers, here judges, chopped up into all sorts of social pens and labelled accordingly. These differences are necessary and important to the practical business of life. You cannot all command the ship. But Christianity, Jesus Christ, our religion bursts through all this wrappage, this brown paper, this stuff you label men with as tailors or admirals of the fleet, until it gets at the most refreshing thing in the world—*a man. A man* is the most refreshing thing in the world: welling up within him there come, so novel and sacred, his hopes and fears and aspirations, his loves and hates, the humour and tragedy of his life. And Christianity bids us think of each other as *fellow men*, born to help and care for each other. The love of man: 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'

As Baron von Hügel says: 'Right with God, right with man.' That is Christianity. What else? What are these other things you are worrying about? This Christian religion, right with God, right with man, peace with the Eternal, love and service for these brother men, there it stands through the ages and through all variety and complexity of circumstance and organi-

zation. Old Grove wants these. He wants peace with his Maker, he wants to help his missis, the only form of humanity that comes before him. It is beautiful, it is chivalry, it is knighthood in that little dark bedroom—not calling out so that a woman shall not suffer discomfort and annoyance.

Now, brothers and sisters, old Grove is not the only one who wants peace with the Eternal and love for men. They all want it on all the sick beds. They do not always realize it, but they all want it—these children of men up and down our country, not only on sick beds, but in the buoyant, vigorous activities of life. They want it. They want satisfaction for the profound spiritual needs of human nature—peace with the Eternal and love and service of men.

Now the serious thing is this: we are here for realities, and the masses of people in this country of ours do not find these two great values in the Church. They find something else. They find all kinds of things—mysterious ceremonial; endless remarks about this and that; they find many things they do not understand, but they do not find the essence of religion, they do not find peace with the Eternal and love for men—the great dominating, masterful, ruling things. A book like *The Army and Religion* is an awfully serious book. It is testimony on a wide scale to this fact, that they want peace with the Eternal and love for their fellow-men; but as far as England goes they do not find it in any of the Churches, either the Church of England or the Free Churches. Those of us who have lived in great cities do not need to be told this grave fact by *The Army and Religion*, because we have been told it by experience over and over again for the last thirty years.

Now there are two living endeavours to remedy this momentous defect so far as our own Church is concerned. One is the Anglo-Catholic endeavour, and the other the Modern Churchmen's endeavour. Now I desire to speak with the utmost respect of the Anglo-Catholic endeavour. Some of us were brought up in Anglo-Catholic homes, where Keble's *Christian Year* was read Sunday by Sunday, and its chimes will ring in our ears till death. We will not decry the Anglo-Catholic movement or its leaders. Father Stanton, Canon Liddon, Bishop Gore—we will not forget what we owe you, the

nobility of your faith, the consecration of your lives! Will we forget it? No. Some of us in the Modern Churchmen's movement will never be found to decry or to be patient of violent censure of the Anglo-Catholic movement. But there is another side.

Facts are hard, as hard as these paving stones. So far as years of observation have taught me, let me estimate the Anglo-Catholic achievements and its prospects. The Anglo-Catholic movement is setting out with great animation for what it calls the conversion of England. For nearly a hundred years it has been endeavouring the conversion of England. It had men of genius and self-sacrifice like Dolling, and it has been actively endeavouring for two generations, under favourable auspices, the conversion of England. And the English people have had a thoroughly good look at it. I have lived in London surrounded by Anglo-Catholic churches. Simple people would now and then go to harvest festivals, to a funeral, have a look at this function or that. The English people, I say, have had a good look at Anglo-Catholic ceremonial and worship in this Church of our fathers, and they have decided that the eternal verities of the Christian religion and its mighty consolations will not reach them by that way. That is what they have decided in the last sixty years. The movement has had a great opportunity, and I have heard of at least one eminent Anglo-Catholic leader lamenting the failure. It is for ever suitable for a small minority of the English people; for the people themselves it is for ever unsuitable.

Some of us Modern Churchmen think that the present Anglo-Catholicism is rigid and mechanical, that it has no sense of historical vitality, no sense of doctrinal development, that it is taking methods appropriate to an ignorant, picturesque age, and intruding them into a new state of society where they are obsolete. But the determining fact is that the English people have observed it, tried it, and said 'No.' Now, what is the Modern Churchman's ideal? To bring back the great Christian values into this Church of our fathers that is dear to us as life itself. What is his dream? Well, he thinks the Church is living, is growing, is adaptable. He thinks the Church, say, of the thirteenth century as it was then constituted—I am no

historian—was effective. It effectively embraced and presented the great Christian values to that age. But he finds that in a few generations the Church became corrupt in one way or another until, in the generation preceding the Reformation, it did not present the Christian values. Take Albert Dürer's woodcuts of the Apocalypse ten or twenty years before the actual outbreak of the Reformation. Dürer sent from Nuremburg these rough woodcuts for the masses—Tracts for the Times. Look at the four horsemen of the Apocalypse. What are they doing? They are playing havoc with Popes, Cardinals and representatives of the then institutions. The people are delighted, they are so sick of the religion of the day and its insincerities and feebleness, and the misrepresentation it gives of the great Christian values. It is the same with another woodcut, the blowing of the sixth trumpet, where men are fiercely wielding swords, clearing the ground, working havoc with the corruptions of the Church before the Church could be worthy to present peace with the Eternal and love for man.

Modern Churchmen think this is an age akin to the pre-Reformation age. In the Church you repeat words which you have to be good-natured to pass. They do not represent what you want to say, and you are acquiescing and making the best of a bad job. Things are effete, stale; there is the crackling of dead leaves. Do you think revivals and prophets have ceased in England? Oh, no! Another revival is coming. There are all the signs of it—the calm before the storm, the languor, the apprehension, the debility—there are all the signs that a prophet is coming. Are we going to despair of prophets in Oxford? In Oxford, of all places? Did not Lincoln send out Wesley in the eighteenth century? Did not Oriel send out Newman in the nineteenth? What college will hold up its hand and say, 'I send out the prophet for to-day'? But whether we know the college or not, whether it comes from Oxford or not, the revival is coming. I am an old man, and may not live to see it; but, thank God! you will.

What is that prophet going to do? Three things. In three branches he is going to have radical reform. (1) A great simplification of doctrine. Take the Thirty-nine Articles. We assent to them—I speak of them historically—we all re-

spect them. Their writers were fighting a great battle and they presented in the language of the day a living statement of the eternal values. Do not let us decry them. But what choking, stifling words they are, over-growing essential realities! And the credal statements themselves. Take such a sentence as, 'He descended into hell.' How ingenious theologians are; how they dive and fish and hunt to say something which will not give that sentence away, and yet shall be acceptable to a critical mind. Such exasperating gymnastics and antics of exposition are not dignified or genuine. So that when the prophet and the revival come, something of this kind will happen. Let the credal statements be disused in public worship; let them be placed in an historical section of the Prayer Book as a guide and as a standard for historical growth and belief. Then let the expression of faith in the service (this is a suggestion by Dr. Temple, Bishop of Manchester, in a London paper about two years ago) be a spiritual one. At the time for the profession of faith let the congregation stand up, turn to the East, and say the Beatitudes. That may be too drastic a change to be forced on at once, but it might be introduced as an alternative use. The creeds are intellectual, and those who preferred could go on with the intellectual statement for the time being, but there must be many who, thinking these great spiritual affirmations to be more at the heart of things, would adopt the new plan.

(2) Secondly, the prophet will embrace in the Catholic Church all Christians. Of course there is encouraging work in this direction, but we are a long way off the goal, and I must say we have sinned seriously in the English Church in a certain subtle patronage of Christians of other views. It is due, I think, to social reasons, but there has been a certain subtle patronage of other Christians which happily is wearing out. When I was a boy in the country it was rampant and disgraceful. This revival will embrace all Christians. The richness of it! You have stood under the dome of St. Peter's in Rome, where you see the inscription, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' We want that—the great Roman tradition, the marvellous Roman genius for the sacramental system, the outward and visible signs and the inward

and spiritual grace. I have heard Roman Catholics say: 'When you go into one of your churches the walls confine you, and you don't see beyond. When you come into ours you can *see through* the walls.' The sacramental system—we want it. But, again, go to a Quaker meeting. I was at a Quaker meeting some time ago. It was a very quiet meeting. At last a man got up and said: 'There is only one thing that will cure the world, only one thing that will mend society. It is forgiveness. We have to advocate and pursue forgiveness. That is the meaning of the Cross. If you will all start and work for forgiveness you will cure the world's hurt.' That may be true or not, but that man is a member of the Catholic Church, and our prophet when he comes will take care that he is recognized as such. And all these other denominations. You go to-night to the great Wesleyan Central Hall, a crowded service and a beautiful old Wesleyan minister conducting it. Some of the theology preached may not be acceptable to many of us, but it is appropriate to the mental habits of these people. They are doing noble work there for the building up of Christian life, and they are within the Church Catholic.

(3) The third branch of reform the prophet will undertake is this. I ask you the question—have pride, love of money, ambition, worldliness, found a strong footing in our Church, and in the ministry of our Church? Pride, ambition, love of status—have they not crept into the Church? Ah! read Catherine of Siena's first letter to Pope Gregory XI, when circumstances were somewhat akin, when in the ministry and in the body of the Church pride, ambition, love of money, were festering wounds, repelling the masses of the people, and paralysing the spiritual health of the Church. And Catherine of Siena, addressing the Pope familiarly, coaxingly, as 'Daddy,' as the Italian word 'Babbo' should be translated, says: 'O, Daddy! do not give way to that false charity which excuses these things, makes plausible excuses for these evils that are hideous before your eyes—love of money and power in the ministry, love of position, great establishments. Do not give way to that bastard charity which excuses these things to the detriment of the body of Christ. Ointment, ointment—these evils don't want ointment; they like it; it soothes them.

They need *the knife*.' If any of you make excuses for worldliness in the Church, read Catherine of Siena's letter.

The masses of the people know our sins in this respect. The Bishop of London has said that for 'the thousandth time' at meetings in the East End a working man would get up and arraign the whole system of pay and rewards in the ministry of the Church of England. The people know. The well-to-do conscience acquiesces; the unsophisticated conscience is offended. A great headmaster said to me two years ago: 'If you are not sincere, if you have a "card up your sleeve," and you come to be a master at a large public school, seven days are the limit of the time which the boys will take to find you out. They may find you out in three, but if you are not going straight, if you are in any sense of the word a hypocrite, seven days are the limit when the boys will find you out. They never fail.' And so with this Christianity of Jesus Christ which you preach, with its attitude towards wealth, and, on the other hand, the mundane, earthbound habits which you practise within your own society—the unsophisticated people have found you out, and have made up their minds about you. The prophet, when he comes, will put in the knife and will cut this festering matter away.

Now, my young brothers and sisters, you are going to live to see this movement when it comes. Not I, but you. This Church of England, this Church of our fathers, for all its sins shines gloriously through our island story. Take the cathedrals—Durham, Lincoln, Canterbury—what memories they enshrine! You put the sea-shell to your ear and you hear murmurs of the ocean. Put Canterbury Cathedral to your ear, and you hear the pieties of your race—the psalms and prayers of these English folk through the generations, the wedding march, the funeral dirge, the tramp of the old ecclesiastical pageantry. Within those sacred walls there still vibrate the aspirations to heaven of your fathers. And this Church, for the moment sick, is going to revive. You will see it. The Spirit, Whom we think of to-day,[1] will say to it once more: '*Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.*'

[1] Whitsunday.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

By Cyril Norwood, D.Lit., Master of Marlborough.

'And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here or Lo there: for behold, the kingdom of God is within you." '—*St. Luke* xvii, 20-21.

'OUR Father, Which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come' . . . How often we say the words, and with what a vague content of thought, when we come to that petition! Are we praying for a Second Coming which shall roll up all this visible Universe like a scroll, and inaugurate the reign and the happiness of the just under spiritual conditions? Are we praying that Christ may begin to reign in our own hearts? Are we asking that the world may be converted to Christianity? Are we seeking that human nature may be changed? Perhaps; but I doubt whether most of us mean more than that quite vaguely God will make us and the world better.

But the ideal of the Kingdom deserves our closest attention, for its preaching was, after all, so far as we can tell, the main theme of the teaching of Jesus in His ministry on earth; something at once so simple that a little child could understand it, and so powerful that it could re-make the world. I ask you in such brief outline, as alone our conditions admit, to follow with me the actual teaching of our Lord on this topic, because that teaching is our only sure starting-point. And indeed in these days of change, and in the uncertainty of the future, it is not only in this inquiry, but in all the problems both of our own individual life, and still more of the life of the nations and societies of which we are members, that it seems to me imperative to get back behind the traditions and the doctrines of intervening ages, and set our course anew by the simple first teaching, making, if possible, our minds open like that of the child to receive it.

The Kingdom of Heaven, then, is one of which Christ is the Founder, and of which He is the Life. 'All things are

delivered unto me of my Father.' The commission is stated, and there follow the wonderful words of invitation, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me.' It is not we that make the kingdom; it is Christ who made it, and makes it now; it is for us to abide in Him, and He will then abide in us, and from Him the life will come pulsing through all our being.

The condition of our membership is that we must be born again—of the Spirit. It is a tremendous challenge. We must be prepared to reverse every standard of materialism, and to accept a completely new set of values. We attach ourselves to a kingdom which knows nothing of conquest, or worldly dominion, or armies or empires, but one which suffereth violence, which the violent take by force. We must be prepared to account the wisdom of the world as folly, its greatness as mere emptiness, its conception of happiness a false and unsatisfying delusion. We must seek the eternal and the spiritual behind the transitory, behind all that to our senses is apparently real, and stake all on that great affirmation that 'He that hath the Son hath eternal life.'

If we can make ourselves fit for membership by repentance, by faith, and by a new life, we can find within the Kingdom all that we need, the satisfaction of the deepest longing of our hearts. We can be sure that our sins are forgiven; we find that we are called on for the active exercise of all our energies and of whatever talent we may possess; we are shown that our noblest work is to serve, and if we can rise to it, that our highest privilege may be sacrifice. The call of the Kingdom is an affirmation of life, of full social life—not of asceticism, nor of mere other-worldliness. I can find nothing in the teaching that tells us that we should be turning this life into one long preparation for death, and bemusing our minds with the longing for that other and happier sphere into which we are to enter. Honest human nature rebels against this: and Christ was Very Man as He was Very God.

> 'Whatever crazy sorrow saith,
> No life that breathes with human breath
> Has ever truly longed for death.'

And it is life which Christ offers us, nay, demands of us, in His Kingdom.

For the seed germinating within spreads, grows, casts out its branches into the air; from within wells up a force which must find vent outwardly—where else than in the activities of life, changing, re-making, ever building anew and better the conditions of human existence? What is the test that our Lord always applies? Is it not the test of fruit? What fruit does the tree bear? What does the man, as a matter of fact, do? Does he lose the seed that is sown, or let the plant wither quickly, or let it be choked by the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, or does he bring forth fruit thirty, sixty, a hundred-fold? The life is always growing; the Kingdom is capable of infinite development. It is like the leaven in the meal, like the grain of mustard seed; there is no human activity which it cannot change, invigorate, and inspire.

It is universal, active here under the conditions of time and space, but transcending these, both earthly and eternal, in time and not in time. Our voyage is set to infinite horizons, but the test of our fitness is now.

It is the great adventure, but it is not a solitary quest—this Kingdom in which Christ offers us our place. We go forth in the ranks of a crusade, Christ our Captain; we do not ride like solitary knights, seeking each our individual vision of the Holy Grail. How different a vision is this from that perversion of the teaching, by which life was darkened down, was narrowed down, to a sordid, selfish pilgrimage to save one's soul from the hell-fire predestined for others! Followers, and by their lights honest followers, of Him of Whom it was said, 'He saved others, Himself He could not save': how could they come to think that it could be pleasing to Him that the record of their lives should be written, 'They saved themselves, others they did not try to save.' They had forgotten the terms of their membership of the Kingdom; for its spirit is that in which Matthew Arnold in Rugby Chapel cries to the spirit of his father:

> 'But thou would'st not *alone*
> Be saved, my father! *alone*
> Conquer and come to thy goal,
> Leaving the rest in the wild.'

True leaders of the army of the Kingdom—they order the march of humanity. Their presence is marked along the lines by the returning courage, the re-kindling eyes :

> ' Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
> Strengthen the wavering line,
> Stablish, continue our march,
> On, to the bound of the waste,
> Oh, to the City of God ! '

Nineteen centuries have nearly passed since these ideals were preached, surely enough time to test them. Are they true? and do they work? It is both fair and necessary to bring them to the test of human history, particularly at this moment. We are full of disillusionment, still under the shadow of a war in which most men fought for the sake of ideals, for the eternal values; we are fresh from a victory which was to give us a new earth, and which as a matter of truth has given us little yet but disappointment. The cynic points with detachment to the fact that Europe, and our country in particular, are strewn with the fragments of the New Jerusalem. But when I hear that clever but easy epigram, my thoughts go back to the great Augustine, who, when Alaric had sacked Rome, sat down to write his noble vision of the City of God. Rome sacked and burned, the visible order of society broken up, civilization shaken and reeling backwards towards barbarism, heathen nations invading on every frontier—and yet Augustine sees the vision of God's City, the Kingdom of Heaven. And I see in thought the dark ages come and pass, and in the twilight of the dawn another great figure, Charlemagne, slowly building order out of chaos —and in his hands what book? What other than Augustine's *City of God?* What other vision than that of the Kingdom has strengthened the leaders of humanity, and enabled them to lead each advance, as it has been made?

For it seems to me that it has always been that ideal, and very often that ideal consciously held and acted upon, that has alone borne lasting fruit. If one looks back to those early centuries of our era, it was not the theologians and philosophers, precisely defining the Infinite, nor the ascetics pursuing in the deserts through incredible perversions the cult and the salvation of their own souls; it was not these that helped humanity.

It may be said, and it is true, that the early Church represente a great and a steep decline from the earliest age, but it was th principles of the Kingdom within it which at long last staye the cruel bloodshed of the gladiatorial games, drove into men' consciences the equality of mankind, softened the conditions o slavery, and set in motion the process which in the end an after many centuries ended legalized slavery for white men an for black. And at the end of the Roman Empire, when all wa dissolving, not only Augustine caught the light of the visio but Benedict also, who was a true Kingdom-builder when h founded the monastic rule, when catching the spirit of th Founder he adopted his motto, '*Laborare est orare*'; God' service is best done by service in the world. He founded th monasteries which preserved agriculture, which preserved learn ing, preserved education, preserved the spirit of love amon men. What if in time they became corrupt? None the less they were for long citadels of the Kingdom. And the Papac itself at its greatest—what else was it but a magnificent visio of the Kingdom of God? It gathered into itself as a focus organized, and directed all the highest aims of humanity Power and the deceitfulness of riches entered into it, an brought it to the dust; but for three hundred years till th fourteenth century began, it was, as has been truly said, 'th greatest power for good that existed at the time, or perhaps ha ever existed.' Too frequently nowadays we look back on thos ages with a patronizing spirit. Men had great ideas then greater and perhaps more fruitful than ever they have had since nobler than those which inspired the French Revolution. They knew how to live for them, and how to die. The vision of th Kingdom caught them up, and swept them out on the Crusades to write that strange record of reckless daring and cold calcu lation, unselfish enthusiasm and studied baseness, that remains after all the symbol of all splendid endeavour. And though we may know that where two or three are gathered together, there is God's Jerusalem, yet we have lost something of their glorious ability to dare nor count the cost. Was it not the ser vice of the Kingdom that inspired in that great age Francis in Assisi, and Dominic in Spain, to send forth their friars to carry into the poorest quarters of those plague-ridden, mediaeval

towns the service and the charity and the Christian love which others had forgotten to render?

These are the movements that count, and lift up men. I have not the time to attempt a full study of all the centuries, but it would confirm what I say. The Renaissance widens the range, opens a new world; it is a net cast into the sea that gathered of every kind, and therefore like the Kingdom of Heaven. It taught men that not only the monk and the friar, the priest and the saint, but the artist and the poet, the lawyer and the soldier might all be conscious servants of the Kingdom of God. Erasmus is the most typical and gracious figure of all the movement, and Erasmus was consciously a child of the Kingdom and a preacher thereof. And I seem to see the ideal spreading and bearing its noble fruit in the most diverse quarters—Loyola founding his Order of Jesuits as soldiers of God, the Quakers founding Pennsylvania.

The vision seemed to fade away. We passed into a smaller age, when to be enthusiastic was to be silly and ill-mannered, and for the great adventure was substituted a polite observance of correct conventions. Somehow or other the call of Wesley and of the Evangelicals was too individual, the call of the Catholic Revival too esoteric. That great movement of the human spirit which we call the French Revolution, that profound structural change of society which we call the Industrial Revolution, were not touched by the ideals of the Kingdom, nor baptized into Christ. From that have followed in large measure the troubles from which we all suffer to-day.

But though the record of the organized Churches is not good, though they have realized insufficiently that the spirit of Christ's Kingdom must find expression in all human activities, individual and social, there have not been lacking men and women who have worked first and foremost for the coming of the Kingdom. In our country a Shaftesbury, a Kingsley, a Maurice, a Livingstone, a William Booth, and many a humbler follower of these. Steadily the feeling has grown that we cannot be saved alone, that we must be saved by saving one another; in no century have so many, both within and without the Churches, devoted themselves to service without hope of earthly reward.

If our social system, if our industrial system have in these past few years betrayed, as we know they have, their hopelessness, all the clearer is the call of the Kingdom. Clearer than in the days of the Crusades comes the call, and the work to be done is made known to us, and marked out, as it is not for every generation. The work of the Kingdom to-day is to seek to build the League of Nations; it is to bring about Christian Re-union; it is to bring peace and the Gospel of Christ to all the earth. How these things are to be done is not for me to say, but that they are to be done, that they are the test of loyalty to the Kingdom, I know. Let us pray that they are the fruits by which we shall be known; let us pray that the Holy Spirit will guide us in all wisdom, and that we shall have the strength to follow the guidance we receive.

We know that the task is infinite; that the city we seek is 'never built at all, and therefore built for ever.' But we know that we finite creatures are also children of the infinite, because we are the children of God. We know too that the Kingdom of God is wider than the Churches, but faint hearts that we are, we do not see all that are on our side. We know that Christ, if He be lifted up, will draw all men unto Him. We know that in His Spirit and for His Kingdom's sake all the great work of the world has been done, and that on our age too great tasks are laid. Lift up your hearts, and in your hearts lift up the Christ; and in His sign go forth, and conquer.

A PRAYER FOR THE CHURCH.

Composed by the ever memorable John Hales (1584-1656).

Look down, O Lord, upon thy poor dismembered Church, rent and torn with discord, and even ready to sink. We will hope, O Lord, that notwithstanding all supposed impossibilities, thou wilt one day in mercy look down upon thy Sion, and grant a gracious interview of friends so long divided. Thou that wroughtest that great reconciliation between God and man, is thine arm waxen shorter? Was it possible to reconcile God to man? To reconcile man to man, is it impossible? Direct thy Church, O Lord, in all her petitions for peace, teach her wherein her peace consists, and warn her from the world, and bring her home to thee; that all those that love thy peace, may at last have the reward of the sons of peace, and reign with thee in thy kingdom of peace forever! *Amen.*